

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 26 are pending in the present application and stand rejected. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable and requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,314 issued to Ludwig et al. The Examiner has rejected the dependent claims as either anticipated by Ludwig or obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Ludwig in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,906 issued to Kumar.

Ludwig discloses creation by an expert of a graphical image 221 that is displayed over a graphical image 220 so that image 220 is no longer visible.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising in part, “displaying said second file only on said primary workstation as an overlay to said first file, wherein said second file is not viewable by said at least one secondary viewer.”

Claim 11 recites a method comprising in part, “accessing a file for said collaboration, said file having a first and second states, in which data stored in said first state is displayed to all of said plurality of remote users, and in which data stored in said second state is displayed only to said host as an overlay to said first state.”

Claim 19 recites a system comprising in part, “said first workstation containing programmed instructions to cause the first file to be displayed on both the first workstation and the at least one video display, and to cause the second file to be displayed only on the first workstation as an overlay to said first file.”

Claim 25 recites instructions comprising in part, “accessing a second file, said second file comprising annotations to said first file; and displaying said second file only on said primary workstation, wherein said second file is not viewable on said secondary workstation.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Ludwig fails to teach, suggest or disclose an “overlay” as recited by Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25. The graphical image 220 is not visible beneath


the graphical image 221 as depicted by Figures 36 and 37 of Ludwig. The Examiner comments that the "invention is about 'transparent overlay' while the claimed language is only about 'overlay'" with the two terms having different implications. Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the written description which indicates that the overlay is transparent without requiring the Examiner's suggested language:

The annotation file may be displayed as an overlay to the target file, so that the leader can view both the target file, as seen by all users and the annotation file, which is only seen by the leader. (pg. 2, lines 31-33)

The written description describes an overlay junction 50 which displays the overlay by replacing pixel values according the annotation file. (pg. 7, lines 20-27) Ludwig fails to teach, suggest or disclose any display in which the image 220 is visible through the image 221 and therefore fails to teach, disclose or suggest the recited "overlay." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25 are allowable, as are claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-24 and 26 which depend respectively from Claims 1, 11, 19 and 25.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent via facsimile to Commissioner for Patents on July 22, 2003.	
	22 JUL 2003
Attorney for Applicant(s)	Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020